

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application, of which, Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 are independent. Claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph, and under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Those rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter, namely, that Claims 18-20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant is incorporating subject matter similar to the identified allowable subject matter (i.e., the subject matter of dependent Claims 18-20) into respective base Claims 1, 5, and 9. Also, independent Claim 13 has been similarly amended.

While the allowable subject matter of Claims 18-20 provides for the case in which a lookup table is updated by adding a new route to the lookup table, it should be noted that the lookup table may similarly (and in accordance with the principals of the claimed embodiments) be updated by deleting an existing route from the lookup table (*see* Applicant's specification, page 49, line 26 – page 50, line 3). Therefore, not only have independent Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 been amended to incorporate subject matter similar to the allowable subject matter of Claims 18-20 (i.e., the addition of a new route), but they have also been amended to provide for the case in which the lookup table is updated by deleting an existing route.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding independent Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13, the Office states that "it is not clear how the second set of routes is derived from the first set of routes," and indicates that the language of Claims 18-20 is more clear. Accordingly, the amendments to Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13, which incorporate subject matter similar to the subject matter of Claims 18-20, and which remove the

term “derived” from the claims, are believed to overcome the rejections of Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Dependent Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, and 14-20 were rejected based on the rejections of independent Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13; thus, the dependent claims are now also believed to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

As such, the rejections of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, are believed to be overcome. Withdrawal of those rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Because subject matter similar to the allowable subject matter of Claims 18-20 has been incorporated into independent Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13, the rejections of those claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are believed to be overcome.

Dependent Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, and 14-17 depend from either independent Claims 1, 5, 9, or 13 and, thus, are allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of dependent Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are also overcome.

As such, withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested. Accordingly, acceptance of Claims 1-20 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims (Claims 1-20) are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 

Patrick A. Quinlan

Registration No. 61,287

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Date: 2/5/08